

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated July 13, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Claims 2-4 and 20 have been deemed to describe allowable subject matter. Claims 2-4, though allowable, have been objected to for depending on rejected base claims. Claims 11-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jongman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0021423). Claims 7, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being Jongman.

To expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant hereinabove incorporates the features of allowable claim 2 into independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

With regard to the rejection of claims 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicant amends independent claim 11 as set forth above. One skilled in the art would understand that the number of light emitting elements corresponds to the spectral sensitivity of the photosensitive material to be exposed, to thus provide the proper exposure. Though the Examiner contends that claim 11 is indefinite because the claim does not recite which types of light emitting elements are used and how the types of light emitting elements are aligned. Applicant submits that such details are not necessary. This is because the claims need not recite the details of a preferred embodiment (such as Fig. 2). Thus, the relation between the number of light emitting elements and a sensitivity of

the medium to be recorded sufficiently informs one skilled in the art of the scope of the claim. Therefore, the Section 112 rejection of claims 11-19 should be withdrawn. Because no prior art rejection has been applied against claims 11-19, and the amendment proposed does not alter the scope of the claim, Applicant submits that any future prior art rejection of claims 11-19 must be made on a non-final basis. Claim 11, as originally filed, includes the description of multiple exposure of a position on the photosensitive medium by light emitting elements. Because Jongman is directed to a display, the reference cannot teach multiple exposure of a position on a photosensitive medium.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan P. Mion
Registration No. 41,239

Date: October 13, 2006